



INDIANA DEPARTMENT  
OF  
CHILD SERVICES

Quarterly Report  
to  
The Indiana State Budget Committee  
and  
The Indiana Legislative Council

Submitted by:  
James W. Payne, Director  
For the quarter ended  
September 30, 2007



*Protecting our children, families and future*

Pursuant to IC 31-33-1.5, once every three months, the Department of Child Services is required to submit a report to the Budget Committee and the Legislative Council that provides data and statistical information regarding caseloads of child protection workers.

This report details:

1. The department's progress in recruiting, training and retaining caseworkers
2. The methodology used to compute caseloads for each child protection worker
3. The statewide average caseloads for child protection caseworkers and whether they exceed the standards established by the department
4. A written plan that indicates steps that are being taken to reduce caseloads if the report indicates that average caseloads exceed caseload standards
5. Recommendations for best management practices and resources required to achieve effective and efficient delivery of child protection services

#### 1. Recruitment, Training and Retention of Family Case Managers

In order to reach the goal of adding 400 new family case managers (FCMs) and 75 new supervisors in SFY 2008, DCS continues to look at personnel and training needs along with capacity. DCS currently has an embedded Human Resources Manager, plus four other staff positions in State Personnel to support the agency. With these resources, the recruitment and hiring process is operating smoothly.

A timeline was established to outline the steps beginning with identifying counties in need of staff and ending with the FCMs first day of work. The process takes a minimum of eleven weeks and requires interviewing a minimum of seven applicants for each position available. Recruiting and interviewing is done locally; the process is managed by Central Office and is detailed in Exhibit 1. Whenever possible, more lead time is added to allow for more flexibility.

DCS determines the optimum hiring schedule on a rolling basis—at least eleven weeks before the start date. The first class began July 5, 2005 and a new class was added nearly every two weeks for a total of 23 classes during SFY 2006 and 20 classes during SFY 2007. In each new bi-weekly class, slots were created for both new hires and vacancy fills, depending on need. Groups ranged in size from 25 to 30. The location of the training cohort was regionally based and corresponded with where the trainees would eventually be stationed.



*Protecting our children, families and future*

The training course itself has been revised based upon the feedback of graduates. For the first eleven months of fiscal year 2006, training took place over a twelve week period. Four of the twelve weeks took place in Indianapolis and the other eight were set in one of the regional training centers. In May 2006, the course was reduced to nine weeks of work in a classroom with transfer of learning days occurring in the county offices. Following that are three weeks of on-the-job training. Further enhancements to both the transfer of learning activities and on-the-job training are under development and will be outlined in a future report.

Since July 1, 2005, the Department of Child Services (DCS) has increased the total number of FCM positions by 462, from 842 to 1,304. The number of filled FCM positions increased from 708 as of July 1, 2005 to 1191 on September 30, 2007, representing an increase of 483 people. The chart below summarizes the increases.

Data as of:	<u>7/01/2005</u>	<u>6/30/2006</u>	<u>9/30/2007</u>	<u>Gain/ (Loss)</u>
# of FCM 2 & 3 positions	842	1017	1304	462
# of filled FCM positions	708	1012	1191	483
# of FCM vacancies	134	5	113	(21)

During SFY 2006, SFY 2007 and the first quarter of SFY 2008, 910 Family Case Managers have been hired. Four hundred and sixty-two of the 910 are new positions that have been allocated since July 1, 2005. The remaining 448 FCMs have been hired to fill vacancies due to terminations, resignations, promotions, retirements and transfers to different agencies. Overall, 403 FCMs have left state employment vis-à-vis termination, resignation or retirement during this time period. Of these, 172 were employed for a year and three quarters or less. The chart below indicates the time frame in which these 172 left state employment.

<u>Time Frame</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
First 3 months	31	18%
4 – 6 months	33	19%
7 – 9 months	28	16%
10 – 12 months	39	23%
13 – 15 months	13	8%
16 – 18 months	13	8%
19 – 21 months	9	5%
22 – 24 months	5	3%
25 – 27 months	1	0%



*Protecting our children, families and future*

DCS has developed an exit interview survey for all employees who leave the Department to complete voluntarily. We have gathered 117 responses since mid April of SFY 2007; the majority of which are from Family Case Managers. Fifty three of the 117 employees that responded are leaving for a better job opportunity. Of those, 20 are leaving for a better rate of pay, followed by 19 who are leaving for a different type of work. The data and commentary show that while employees generally felt that they were aware of the agency's direction and vision, their consensus was that they were not recognized when they did a good job and that their supervisors were not open to suggestions and were not able to provide them with constructive feedback. Most of these concerns should be addressed with the implementation of Practice Reform which will assist in providing a mechanism to improve communication, feedback, and teamwork at all levels. Additional focus on the training and development of supervisors should increase staff satisfaction. The training and mentoring programs for supervisors is being enhanced to ensure this issue is addressed.

## 2. Caseload data

On a monthly basis, DCS gathers information to determine which counties are in the greatest need of staff. The information is gathered from Indiana's automated child welfare reporting system (ICWIS) and from local county directors. ICWIS provides information on the number of new investigations opened each month and the number of children served by the county. County directors confirm staffing levels, including total staff, staff in training, and staff unavailable for any reason. This information is loaded into a spreadsheet. DCS is converting to the use of PeopleSoft numbers rather than self-reported numbers, as inconsistencies have been found in the self-reported numbers.

The issue of caseload data must include consideration of the current national discussion regarding caseload definitions. As currently set out in statute, DCS must comply with the Child Welfare League of America standards that include no more than 12 new investigations per month or 17 ongoing children being supervised by a case manager at any one time. DCS must meet these benchmarks by July 1, 2008. Additional legislation allows for a worker who performs both case management of ongoing children and assessments on allegations of abuse and neglect to carry a combined caseload of 10 ongoing and 4 assessments.

Those definitions are clear in large to medium counties, where the caseloads allow those divisions to be clearly defined. In smaller counties, however, the issue of mixed caseloads is more difficult to determine, in large part because ongoing caseloads of 17 are fairly static while new investigation caseloads are fluid, changing day to day, week to week. We



*Protecting our children, families and future*

will continue to work with national leaders and organizations, as these discussions bring more mathematical certainty to those designations.

Exhibit 2 shows the number of FCMs needed to reach 12 investigations OR 17 on-going children. Please note that these numbers are cyclical and vary from month to month.

Additionally, there is tremendous national dialogue on the issue of defining caseload versus workload. The distinction has to do with the number of cases a casework manager will have versus the effort necessary to adequately and appropriately provide that work – leading to safety, permanency, and well-being for children and families. This becomes particularly more difficult as we add to or significantly change the workload requirements for case managers either by statute or by policy. One example of this is the recent requirement for more extensive criminal background checks, specifically referring to the time and complexity involved for a case manager to obtain those background checks.

Finally, the issue of caseload reduction could be impacted greatly as DCS implements its philosophy of practice in safety for children remaining at home, implementing a practice of engaging families through team participation, and more accurate assessment of initial care and ongoing treatment. Over time, it is anticipated that these matters will be effective in reducing the degree and intensity of involvement and various stages through the process, and therefore provide better outcomes for families.

### 3. Percentage of caseloads in compliance with standards.

Analysis of Exhibit 2 indicates that, as of September, 2007, 4.3% or 4 counties meet the 12/17 standard.

It should be noted that these numbers are based on peak caseload assumptions. It is possible that any individual FCM will be carrying a caseload in excess of benchmark. However, as additional FCMs are hired and trained, and existing FCMs are retained on the job, the peak figure should better reflect actuals. Moreover, as additional FCMs are hired, based on allowances set in the biennium budget, caseloads should decline and approach acceptable levels.



*Protecting our children, families and future*

#### 4. Plans to reduce caseloads

DCS will continue with the plan to hire 400 more case managers for SFY 2008 (as funded by the General Assembly) in addition to 75 supervisors. Monthly, the caseload averages will be calculated and analyzed.

#### 5. Effective and Efficient Delivery of Child Protection Services

Beginning December 2005, DCS embarked upon a comprehensive practice reform initiative. It is a grass roots initiative that will teach Family Case Managers how to engage and team with families in ways the department has never done. We believe this approach will have significant long-term impact on positive outcomes for children and families, leading to shorter lengths of stay, faster reunification or permanence and will ultimately reduce case loads.

Although many positive steps occurred to facilitate the effective and professional delivery of child protection services, many challenges remain. They include:

- Continuing to hire new FCMs to reach legislated caseloads
- Ensuring proper support of FCMs through sufficient supervision
- Maintaining sufficient support staff for supervisors and FCMs in local offices
- Retaining sufficient legal staff to support legal needs of local offices
- Preserving sufficient administrative staff to support county operations
- Increasing Central Office staff to sufficiently support financial, policy, training, programs, and quality assurance

As mentioned previously, DCS will continue to hire FCMs and supervisors throughout SFY 2008 as provided for in the budget. All required legal staff should be in place by the end of SFY 2008. Local contract attorney positions have been and continue to be converted into state staff attorneys. Under this arrangement, legal counsel for the department is more comprehensive and congruent as FCMs and lawyers work together in the same office to prepare cases.



*Protecting our children, families and future*

# Cohort Hiring Status Report

## SFY 06

	Cohort #	Identify County	Training Location chosen	Post	Recruit	Applications evaluated and routed	Interview Complete	Position Offered	Position Accepted	Copy of offer/ information letter/release for background check to Central Office	Background Check Begun	Packet Sent	Hotel Confirmation	Start Date	Graduation Date
Responsibility		Stephanie Beasley	Stephanie Beasley	Yonda Snyder, SPD	HR, Regional Managers, County Directors	Yonda Snyder, SPD	Regional Managers, County Directors	Regional Managers, County Directors	Applicant	Regional Managers, County Directors	Yonda Snyder, SPD	Regional Managers, County Directors	Peggy Farrar	Employee	Employee
Time Frame		Day One	Day One	Day One	Day 14	Day 21	Day 28	Day 35	Day 42	Day 44	Day 45	Day 46	Day 49	Day 56	Day 140
	1	11-May	Marion County	11-May	24-May	31-May	7-Jun	14-Jun	21-Jun	23-Jun	24-Jun	25-Jun	28-Jun	5-Jul	27-Sep
	2	24-May	Marion County	24-May	6-Jun	13-Jun	20-Jun	27-Jun	4-Jul	6-Jul	7-Jul	8-Jul	11-Jul	18-Jul	10-Oct
	3	7-Jun	Marion County	7-Jun	20-Jun	27-Jun	4-Jul	11-Jul	18-Jul	20-Jul	21-Jul	22-Jul	25-Jul	1-Aug	24-Oct
	4	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID
	5	13-Jul	Marion County	13-Jul	26-Jul	2-Aug	9-Aug	16-Aug	23-Aug	25-Aug	26-Aug	27-Aug	30-Aug	6-Sep	29-Nov
	6	23-Jul	Fort Wayne	23-Jul	5-Aug	12-Aug	19-Aug	26-Aug	2-Sep	4-Sep	5-Sep	6-Sep	9-Sep	16-Sep	9-Dec
	7	9-Aug	Scottsburg	9-Aug	22-Aug	29-Aug	5-Sep	12-Sep	19-Sep	21-Sep	22-Sep	23-Sep	26-Sep	3-Oct	26-Dec
	8	23-Aug	Vincennes	23-Aug	5-Sep	12-Sep	19-Sep	26-Sep	3-Oct	5-Oct	6-Oct	7-Oct	10-Oct	17-Oct	9-Jan
	9	20-Sep	Indianapolis	20-Sep	3-Oct	10-Oct	17-Oct	24-Oct	31-Oct	2-Nov	3-Nov	4-Nov	7-Nov	14-Nov	6-Feb
	10	4-Oct	Michigan City	4-Oct	17-Oct	24-Oct	31-Oct	7-Nov	14-Nov	16-Nov	17-Nov	18-Nov	21-Nov	28-Nov	20-Feb
	11	18-Oct	Indianapolis	18-Oct	31-Oct	7-Nov	14-Nov	21-Nov	28-Nov	30-Nov	1-Dec	2-Dec	5-Dec	12-Dec	6-Mar
	12	15-Nov	Scottsburg	15-Nov	28-Nov	5-Dec	12-Dec	19-Dec	26-Dec	28-Dec	29-Dec	30-Dec	2-Jan	9-Jan	3-Apr
	13	29-Nov	Indianapolis	29-Nov	12-Dec	19-Dec	26-Dec	2-Jan	9-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	13-Jan	16-Jan	23-Jan	17-Apr
	14	13-Dec	Indianapolis	13-Dec	26-Dec	2-Jan	9-Jan	16-Jan	23-Jan	25-Jan	26-Jan	27-Jan	30-Jan	6-Feb	1-May
	15	27-Dec	Indianapolis	27-Dec	9-Jan	16-Jan	23-Jan	30-Jan	6-Feb	8-Feb	9-Feb	10-Feb	13-Feb	20-Feb	15-May
	16	10-Jan	Michigan City	10-Jan	23-Jan	30-Jan	6-Feb	13-Feb	20-Feb	22-Feb	23-Feb	24-Feb	27-Feb	6-Mar	29-May
	17	24-Jan	Marion	24-Jan	6-Feb	13-Feb	20-Feb	27-Feb	6-Mar	8-Mar	9-Mar	10-Mar	13-Mar	20-Mar	12-Jun
	18	7-Feb	Marion County	7-Feb	20-Feb	27-Feb	6-Mar	13-Mar	20-Mar	22-Mar	23-Mar	24-Mar	27-Mar	3-Apr	26-Jun
	19	21-Jan	Scottsburg	21-Jan	3-Feb	10-Feb	17-Feb	24-Feb	3-Mar	5-Mar	6-Mar	7-Mar	10-Mar	17-Mar	9-Jun
	20	7-Mar	Fort Wayne	7-Mar	20-Mar	27-Mar	3-Apr	10-Apr	17-Apr	19-Apr	20-Apr	21-Apr	24-Apr	1-May	24-Jul
	21	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID	VOID
	22	11-Apr	Vincennes	11-Apr	24-Apr	1-May	8-May	15-May	22-May	24-May	25-May	26-May	29-May	5-Jun	28-Aug
	23	25-Apr	Marion County	25-Apr	8-May	15-May	22-May	29-May	5-Jun	7-Jun	8-Jun	9-Jun	12-Jun	19-Jun	11-Sep

# Cohort Hiring Timeline

## SFY 07

### Exhibit 1

	Cohort #	Identify County	Training Location chosen	Post Internally	Post Externally	Recruit	Applications evaluated and routed	Interview Complete*	Position Offered*	Position Accepted	Send Signed Applicant Release form to HR	Offer Letter Sent	Hotel Confirmation Complete	Start Date	Graduation Date
Responsibility		Stephanie Beasley	Stephanie Beasley	HR/SPD	HR/SPD	HR, Regional Managers, County Directors	SPD Recruiters	Regional Managers, County Directors	Regional Managers, County Directors	Applicant	Regional Managers, County Directors	HR/SPD	Peggy Farrar	Employee	Employee
Time Frame		Day One	Day One	Day One	Day 22	Day 35	Day 42	Day 49	Day 56	Day 63	Day 65	Day 67	Day 70	Day 77	Day 161
24	16-May-06	Fort Wayne	N/A	16-May	29-May	5-Jun	12-Jun	19-Jun	26-Jun	28-Jun	30-Jun	3-Jul	10-Jul	2-Oct	
25	30-May-06	Michigan City	N/A	30-May	12-Jun	19-Jun	26-Jun	3-Jul	10-Jul	12-Jul	14-Jul	17-Jul	24-Jul	16-Oct	
26	13-Jun-06	Muncie	N/A	13-Jun	26-Jun	3-Jul	10-Jul	17-Jul	24-Jul	26-Jul	28-Jul	31-Jul	7-Aug	30-Oct	
27	27-Jun-06	Scottsburg	N/A	27-Jun	10-Jul	17-Jul	24-Jul	31-Jul	7-Aug	9-Aug	11-Aug	14-Aug	21-Aug	13-Nov	
28	12-Jul-06	Michigan City	N/A	12-Jul	25-Jul	1-Aug	8-Aug	15-Aug	22-Aug	24-Aug	26-Aug	29-Aug	5-Sep	28-Nov	
29	25-Jul-06	Marion County	N/A	25-Jul	7-Aug	14-Aug	21-Aug	28-Aug	4-Sep	6-Sep	8-Sep	11-Sep	18-Sep	11-Dec	
30	8-Aug-06	Indianapolis	N/A	8-Aug	21-Aug	28-Aug	4-Sep	11-Sep	18-Sep	20-Sep	22-Sep	25-Sep	2-Oct	25-Dec	
31	22-Aug-06	Vincennes	N/A	22-Aug	4-Sep	11-Sep	18-Sep	25-Sep	2-Oct	4-Oct	6-Oct	9-Oct	16-Oct	8-Jan	
32	5-Sep-06	Fort Wayne	N/A	5-Sep	18-Sep	25-Sep	2-Oct	9-Oct	16-Oct	18-Oct	20-Oct	23-Oct	30-Oct	22-Jan	
33	19-Sep-06	Muncie	N/A	19-Sep	2-Oct	9-Oct	16-Oct	23-Oct	30-Oct	1-Nov	3-Nov	6-Nov	13-Nov	5-Feb	
34	3-Oct-06	Vincennes	N/A	3-Oct	16-Oct	23-Oct	30-Oct	6-Nov	13-Nov	15-Nov	17-Nov	20-Nov	27-Nov	19-Feb	
35	17-Oct-06	Michigan City	N/A	17-Oct	30-Oct	6-Nov	13-Nov	20-Nov	27-Nov	29-Nov	1-Dec	4-Dec	11-Dec	5-Mar	
36	28-Nov-06	Marion County	N/A	28-Nov	11-Dec	18-Dec	25-Dec	1-Jan	8-Jan	10-Jan	12-Jan	15-Jan	22-Jan	16-Apr	
37	12-Dec-06	Fort Wayne	N/A	12-Dec	25-Dec	1-Jan	8-Jan	15-Jan	22-Jan	24-Jan	26-Jan	29-Jan	5-Feb	30-Apr	
38	26-Dec-06	Marion County	N/A	26-Dec	8-Jan	15-Jan	22-Jan	29-Jan	5-Feb	7-Feb	9-Feb	12-Feb	19-Feb	14-May	
39	23-Jan-07	*Skipped*	N/A	23-Jan	5-Feb	12-Feb	19-Feb	26-Feb	5-Mar	7-Mar	9-Mar	12-Mar	19-Mar	11-Jun	
40	6-Feb-07	Marion County	N/A	6-Feb	19-Feb	26-Feb	5-Mar	12-Mar	19-Mar	21-Mar	23-Mar	26-Mar	2-Apr	25-Jun	
41	20-Feb-07	Scottsburg	N/A	20-Feb	5-Mar	12-Mar	19-Mar	26-Mar	2-Apr	4-Apr	6-Apr	9-Apr	16-Apr	9-Jul	
42	20-Mar-07	*Skipped*	N/A	20-Mar	2-Apr	9-Apr	16-Apr	23-Apr	30-Apr	2-May	4-May	7-May	14-May	6-Aug	
43	17-Apr-07	Marion County	N/A	17-Apr	30-Apr	7-May	14-May	21-May	28-May	30-May	1-Jun	4-Jun	11-Jun	3-Sep	



# Exhibit 1

[illegible]

## Exhibit 2

Region	County	12/17 FCM Projected Need	Current PCN's	12/17 PCN Need	PCN % Attained	Current FCM's	Current Vacancies	12/17 FCM Need	FCM % Attained
4	Adams	4	3	1	75%	3	0	1	75%
4	Allen	103	87	16	84%	79	8	24	77%
14	Bartholomew	20	16	4	81%	16	0	4	81%
5	Benton	4	3	1	82%	3	0	1	82%
7	Blackford	3	3	0	92%	3	0	0	92%
9	Boone	7	6	1	80%	5	1	2	67%
13	Brown	3	2	1	74%	2	0	1	74%
5	Carroll	2	2	0	102%	2	0	0	102%
6	Cass	6	5	1	78%	4	1	2	62%
18	Clark	28	25	3	90%	24	1	4	86%
8	Clay	4	3	1	82%	3	0	1	82%
5	Clinton	8	7	1	93%	7	0	1	93%
17	Crawford	6	5	1	86%	5	0	1	86%
17	Daviess	6	4	2	63%	4	0	2	63%
15	Dearborn	11	8	3	70%	6	2	5	53%
15	Decatur	10	8	2	83%	7	1	3	72%
4	DeKalb	13	10	3	80%	9	1	4	72%
7	Delaware	39	34	5	86%	33	1	6	84%
17	Dubois	5	5	0	102%	5	0	0	102%
3	Elkhart	41	30	11	73%	27	3	14	65%
12	Fayette	10	9	1	93%	8	1	2	83%
18	Floyd	13	9	4	69%	8	1	5	61%
5	Fountain	6	4	2	68%	3	1	3	51%
12	Franklin	7	5	2	72%	5	0	2	72%
6	Fulton	5	4	1	86%	3	1	2	64%
16	Gibson	11	8	3	74%	6	2	5	56%
7	Grant	17	16	1	92%	15	1	2	86%
13	Greene	11	10	1	91%	10	0	1	91%
11	Hamilton	18	10	8	56%	10	0	8	56%
11	Hancock	8	6	2	76%	6	0	2	76%
18	Harrison	11	8	3	73%	7	1	4	64%
9	Hendricks	10	8	2	83%	7	1	3	72%
12	Henry	14	10	4	74%	9	1	5	66%
6	Howard	17	13	4	78%	13	0	4	78%
4	Huntington	7	6	1	82%	5	1	2	69%

Projected FCM Staffing Needs

1	Lake	160	149	11	93%	138	11	22	86%
2	LaPorte	21	16	5	76%	16	0	5	76%
13	Lawrence	10	6	4	59%	5	1	5	49%
11	Madison	32	28	4	88%	26	2	6	81%
10	Marion	273	239	34	87%	207	32	66	76%
3	Marshall	11	9	2	84%	9	0	2	84%
17	Martin	2	1	1	57%	1	0	1	57%
6	Miami	9	8	1	85%	8	0	1	85%
13	Monroe	20	18	2	89%	17	1	3	84%
9	Montgomery	16	14	2	90%	14	0	2	90%
9	Morgan	12	9	3	76%	9	0	3	76%
2	Newton	5	3	2	65%	3	0	2	65%
4	Noble	10	7	3	70%	6	1	4	60%
15	Ohio	1	1	0	72%	0	1	1	0%
17	Orange	5	3	2	63%	3	0	2	63%
13	Owen	6	4	2	65%	3	1	3	48%
8	Parke	2	2	0	90%	2	0	0	90%
17	Perry	7	5	2	76%	5	0	2	76%
16	Pike	6	4	2	70%	4	0	2	70%
2	Porter	27	24	3	89%	23	1	4	85%
16	Posey	5	4	1	83%	3	1	2	62%
2	Pulaski	4	3	1	72%	3	0	1	72%
9	Putnam	10	8	2	84%	8	0	2	84%
7	Randolph	5	4	1	85%	4	0	1	85%
15	Ripley	10	9	1	88%	6	3	4	59%
12	Rush	7	7	0	100%	6	1	1	86%
3	Saint Joe	65	52	13	80%	45	7	20	69%
18	Scott	15	12	3	81%	11	1	4	74%
14	Shelby	11	9	2	86%	7	2	4	67%
17	Spencer	3	3	0	103%	3	0	0	103%
2	Starke	7	5	2	69%	5	0	2	69%
4	Steuben	15	13	2	87%	12	1	3	80%
8	Sullivan	3	3	0	87%	3	0	0	87%
15	Switzerland	5	4	1	87%	4	0	1	87%
5	Tippecanoe	40	35	5	87%	32	3	8	79%
11	Tipton	2	2	0	88%	2	0	0	88%
12	Union	4	3	1	79%	3	0	1	79%
16	Vanderburgh	54	43	11	79%	40	3	14	74%
8	Vermillion	4	3	1	80%	2	1	2	54%
8	Vigo	27	22	5	82%	21	1	6	78%

Projected FCM Staffing Needs

State Wide Total	1580	1304	276	83%	1191	113	389	75%
------------------	------	------	-----	-----	------	-----	-----	-----